	Case 1:21-cv-01512-ADA-SAB Document	43 Filed	08/31/23	Page 1 of 5	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	ROB BONTA, State Bar No. 202668 Attorney General of California ANYA BINSACCA, State Bar No. 189613 Supervising Deputy Attorney General KRISTIN A. LISKA, State Bar No. 315994 Deputy Attorney General 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 510-3916 Fax: (415) 703-5480 E-mail: Kristin.Liska@doj.ca.gov Attorneys for Defendant IN THE UNITED STAT	ΓES DISTI	RICT COU	JRT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10	FRESNO DIVISION				
11 12	RIGHT TO LIFE OF CENTRAL CALIFORNIA,	Case No.	1:21-cv-0	1512-ADA-SAB	
13 14 15 16	Plaintiff, v. ROB BONTA, in his official capacity as Attorney General of the State of California,	STIPULATION REGARDING FINAL JUDGMENT ENTERING PERMANENT INJUNCTION, AWARDING ATTORNEY'S FEES AND DISMISSING ACTION			
17	Defendant.	Judge:	The	Honorable Ana I. de Alba	
18		Action Fi	iled: 10/1	3/2021	
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					

Plaintiff Right to Life of Central California and Defendant Rob Bonta, Attorney General of the State of California, sued in his official capacity, agree and stipulate as follows:

- 1. In October 2021, Plaintiff filed the complaint in this case against Defendant, challenging SB 742. SB 742 makes it "unlawful to knowingly approach within 30 feet of any person while a person is within 100 feet of the entrance or exit of a vaccination site and is seeking to enter or exit a vaccination site, or any occupied motor vehicle seeking entry or exit to a vaccination site, for the purpose of obstructing, injuring, harassing, intimidating, or interfering with that person or vehicle occupant." SB 742 defines "harassing" as "knowingly approaching, without consent, within 30 feet of another person or occupied vehicle for the purpose of passing a leaflet or handbill to, displaying a sign to, or engaging in oral protest, education, or counseling with, that other person in a public way or on a sidewalk area." Plaintiff contends that SB 742 violates its rights under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.
- 2. Shortly after filing suit, plaintiff filed a motion for a temporary restraining order. Following a hearing, this Court granted a temporary restraining order on October 30, 2021, concluding that plaintiff was likely to succeed in its claim that SB 742 violates the First Amendment. The Court tailored its order solely to enjoin enforcement of SB 742's prohibition on approaching within 30 feet of a person for the purpose of "harassing," which the statute defines as including "oral protest" or displaying a sign to that person—unless that oral protest or sign is about a labor dispute. The Court found this provision severable from the remainder of SB 742.
- 3. Plaintiff thereafter filed a motion for a preliminary injunction. This Court granted the motion on July 6, 2022 and entered a preliminary injunction with the same scope as its temporary restraining order.
- 4. This case is one of three cases brought challenging SB 742 on the basis that it is a violation of the First Amendment. In one of the other two cases, *Aubin v. Bonta*, No. 21-cv-07938, the district court entered judgment on March 29, 2023. The *Aubin* court held that SB 742's prohibition on approaching for the purpose of "harassing" as defined in the statute violates the First Amendment. It further held that this prohibition was severable from SB 742's prohibition on approaching for the purposes of intimidating, injuring, interfering with, or

Plaintiff, and to the entry of a permanent injunction and order of dismissal in the form submitted along with this stipulation.

6. Entry of the stipulated permanent injunction and order of dismissal will fully resolve this civil action.

7. The stipulated permanent injunction will be entered under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 and will constitute the final judgment in this matter.

8. Defendant shall pay Plaintiff the sum of \$192,706 for Plaintiff's reasonable attorney's fees and costs necessarily incurred in this case.

/// ///

///

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case 1:21-cv-01512-ADA-SAB Document 43 Filed 08/31/23 Page 4 of 5 1 9. This Court should retain jurisdiction over this matter for the purpose of implementing 2 and enforcing the final judgment. 3 4 Respectfully submitted, 5 Dated: August 29, 2023 ROB BONTA Attorney General of California ANYA BINSACCA 6 Supervising Deputy Attorney General 7 /s/ Kristin Liska 8 KRISTIN A. LISKA 9 Deputy Attorney General 10 Attorneys for Defendant 11 12 Dated: August 29, 2023 ALLIANCE DEFENDING FREEDOM 13 14 /s/ Kevin H. Theriot 15 KEVIN H. THERIOT* DENISE M. HARLE* 16 CHRISTIANA KIEFER 17 Attorneys for Plaintiff Right to Life of 18 Central California 19 *Admitted Pro Hac Vice 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28